

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1916.

No. 912.

THE MINNEAPOLIS & ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY,
Plaintiff in Error,

VS.

GEORGE H. WINTERS,
Defendant in Error.

**DEFENDANT IN ERROR'S SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEF.**

Defendant in error submits the above cause upon his brief served and filed on his Motion to Affirm or Dismiss, with the following additional authorities. We so submit the case because plaintiff in error has not served any brief on the merits except the one served on said motion.

The following are cases involving the repair of cars and engines used in the doing of an interstate commerce busi-

ness, in all of which it was held that the employee so engaged was employed in interstate commerce:

Walsh v. N. Y., N. H. & H. R. R. Co., 223 U. S. 5, 32 S. C. Rep. 169.

Darr v. B. & O. Ry. Co., 197 Fed. 665.

B. & O. Ry. Co. v. Darr, 204 Fed. 751.

Law v. Ill. Cent. Ry. Co., 208 Fed. 869.

N. P. Ry. Co. v. Maerkl, 198 Fed. 1.

Chicago, K. & S. Ry. So. v. Kindlesparker, 234 Fed. 1.

So. Pac. Co. v. Pillsbury, 170 Cal. 782, 151 Pac. 277.

We respectfully submit that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Minnesota should be affirmed.

HUMPHREY BARTON,

JOHN H. KAY,

Attorneys for Defendant in Error,

St. Paul, Minnesota.

